

April 30, 1975

ought to get at the issue. I would say that the issues he's raised were very superficial. They were little nit pick kind of things. Obviously it's a complex bill. Obviously it's a complex subject. I think we tried to address it in that way. It's going to cost. It's going to cost however we take it. If we're going to have community technical schools it's going to cost. We are not creating new schools here. We are acting under a mandate of previous legislators legislation that created the seven districts. Senator Simpson, last year, introduced a bill to create six, which combined the area that I live in that has no facility, that has nothing. I don't blame those who already have it to say we want to keep it and we want somebody else to pay for it. That's easy. The point at hand is that this is a continuation of what this and other legislators have established beforehand for a community technical systems. If you don't want one, reject it, get rid of it. Everyone has talked about coordination of education. No one believes in that any stronger than I do. We have a start on the board now with 579. I'd like for that bill to be stronger, but at least we're going to start talking about it. Each of us come down here and we start saying well listen I got this school in my district and if it's for this we'll do this, this, any other. Coordination is to make sure that yours is taken care of and the other guys isn't. That's not necessarily what we're looking for. Senator Kremer has worked hard and long on this bill. He certainly rejected many many of the ideas that the community technical schools had. He watered down, and took away, and limited to the mill levy. He tried to limit the amount of money that could be put out in terms of capital outlay. The serious question here, and it is a simple one even though the amendments and the bill is complex, it's do you want community technical schools. If you answer yes to that, and it appears to me that most every speaker has said yes, then how do you want to finance them. How do you want them financed? Who do you want to control them? Senator Clark wanted the State Board of Trustees, or the State College Board to control them. I found that a little apprehensive from where I live and from my vantage point. If that's the will and the desire of this Legislature, that's up to you. Let's not be messing around with the bill. Let's address it head-on. LB 344 says we're going to finance them on the basis of partial property tax and state aid to the community technical schools like we do public, elementary and secondary schools. LB 344 says it's up to your board, people elected just like you were elected by the citizens in your district, to determine the destiny and the desires for vocational education. Now that's the issue. The committee amendments very frankly and forthrightly say that we are going to have local control, we're going to have area boards making those decisions for their own communities and their own areas. If you accept that, if that's the premise you accept, that's the direction we ought to go. If that's not the way you want to go and you want none at all, you can offer that. If you want them state financed then I'd say get in the same boat with Bob Clark, and get the bill up there, and kill this one, and move something else across. The decision, to me, is clear. The positions that you ought to take, you ought to be in a position to do that. I'd ask that you adopt the committee amendments and move the bill across the floor.